

~~Trip Report~~
~~Should be submitted~~
~~by 8/1/83~~

PD-AAQ-500
150137735

8/1/83

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION
Trip Report/Evaluation
April 30 - May 7, 1983

by

Ross Edgar Bigelow
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C.

August 1983

Table of Contents

	Page
Purposes of Trip	1
Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	2
Background on the PVO and the Movement	5
Financial Status	9
International Leadership Training	11
International Outreach and Two Affiliated Movements	14
a. The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM)	16
b. The Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement (TRRM)	19
Operations Research and Evaluation	20
Appendix A: IIRR Comments Contained in Ping Chin's Letter of August 4, 1983.	

Purposes of the Trip

The Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation of the Bureau of Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance (FVA/PVC) is considering a second matching grant to the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) in the coming year. It is important to review program experience and determine what form of Agency for International Development (AID) support would be most appropriate for IIRR in the future. For this purpose, during April and May, I spent four days with the staff of IIRR in Silang, Cavite, the Philippines; one day with the Philippines Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM) leadership in Nueve Ecija; and met briefly with Dr. Sopone Phukowluan, Director, The Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement (TRRM) in Bangkok.

This trip report assesses:

- A. How IIRR can achieve a firm financial footing.
- B. The degree of demand of IIRR international leadership training services.
- C. The potential international exchange of experience with affiliated movements around the globe.
- D. How best IIRR's operational research experience can be shared.
- E. The extent to which IIRR's resources might be redirected from research in the Cavite social laboratory to broader international extension and training functions.
- F. How future matching grant support from AID can effectively serve IIRR's needs.

No one can become an instant expert on a subject in one week. However, intensive exposure to the work of the movements has accelerated the observation and learning of this outside observer. The contents of this report are intended to inform and guide the future IIRR-AID relationship. Any errors of fact or interpretation are the responsibility of the author. Views expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of FVA/PVC or AID generally.

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

1A. Conclusion: IIRR has an outstanding capability in a critical development area - International Leadership Training (ILT). Over 500 participants from 37 countries from all regions of the developing world have been trained. This resource has also been tapped by several PVOs - the World Vision Relief Organization, The Christian Children's Fund, and Outreach International. In 1981, fees from such training represented over one quarter of unrestricted income for IIRR. The ILT capability of IIRR should be more fully used. IIRR can play an important role in raising the consciousness of people about development issues like hunger, disease and illiteracy.

1B. Recommendation: That this unique international leadership training capability be made fully known to PVOs, other development agencies and AID itself. IIRR should gradually and judiciously expand its international leadership training program, and spread on-site training to a growing number of countries. This capacity should be publicized by IIRR and perhaps AID. Also a separate indefinite quantity contract might well be considered by AID to facilitate mission work with local PVOs.

2A. Conclusion: Resources from AID represent an important input into IIRR's work - over a third of income in 1981. In the years 1981-83, the matching grant provided over \$1.3 million. IIRR is now seeking renewal of the matching grant for an additional three-five year period, and AID is considering how it can most effectively respond to IIRR's needs.

2B. Recommendation: That the new matching grant be approved with agreement between IIRR and AID that a greater proportion of resources be devoted to international leadership training and international extension. In addition, over the coming three year period a lesser proportion of resources should be devoted directly to operational research by IIRR, allowing the individual movements to enter into this endeavor in collaboration with IIRR.

3A. Conclusion: The energies of IIRR's leadership are divided between the developmental work and fund raising. Covering the annual operating budget of approximately \$1.3 million puts a huge burden on senior IIRR officials. In 1981, about half of revenue came from contributions and another third from a US Government grant. One solution, the self-sufficiency fund (SSF) which IIRR recently created, is

more hope than reality. Through this fund campus crop production on 125 acres can be expected to generate only a portion of IIRR's operating income. Without greater financial stability the work itself could be seriously impaired.

3B. Recommendation: That IIRR, to achieve a firm financial footing, gradually build an endowment from private international sources. Concerted efforts should be made by the IIRR New York Office to realize its potential, including employment of a full-time fund raiser. Dr. Yen's vigor and unique leadership qualities must be fully utilized. Other diversified fund-raising strategies should be entertained, such as the use of television promotion in the U.S. and perhaps the Philippines.

4A. Conclusion: International extension/outreach by IIRR to the sister movements only began a few years ago. It is still a relatively small part of program services. As reflected by 1981 expenditures, international extension represented only 14 percent of total budget, whereas international leadership training and field operations represented 86 percent. Yet international extension is important to the nurturing and growth of the other movements.

4B. Recommendation: That IIRR increase the proportion of program expenditures for international extension to better meet the needs of sister movements. Greater attention should be devoted to senior staff travel, consultant and technical assistance and follow-up in country after training.

5A. Conclusion: The movements in the Philippines, Thailand, Guatemala, Colombia, Ghana, India and Sri Lanka can benefit from one another's country specific experience. Through information exchange, technical assistance and training, the "social laboratories" of many countries can instruct the work of movements elsewhere.

5B. Recommendation: That the Evaluation Research Staffs of IIRR and the various movements team together to learn from a select number of projects each year, and share the lessons learned widely. Thus, the responsibility for learning from experience will be spread to all movements. IIRR should also reorient its thinking about its relationship to the other movements: to conceive of it as a form of two-way international exchange, rather than international outreach/extension.

6A. Conclusion: The "social laboratories" of IIRR and the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement overlap at the expense of PRRM. IIRR can increase its impact in operational research/evaluation by decreasing its direct responsibilities

for implementing field projects and activities in the Philippines. Significant IIRR resources are diverted to direct "operation" of its own social laboratory. The social laboratory in the Philippines should be the principal domain of PRRM.

6B. Recommendation: That PRRM "operate" all social laboratories in various sites in the Philippines. It is better that PRRM be assisted by IIRR to increase its operational research evaluation functions than to have the two institutions competing. IIRR should gradually reduce its role as project initiator and operator in the Philippines and increase its role as facilitator of the exchange of experience among movements in the several countries. IIRR can best play the role of facilitator/interpreter of country specific experience. (For IIRR's reaction to this recommendation, see Appendix A.)

7A. Conclusion: Evaluation and research play an important part in IIRR's several current evaluation projects - "The International Development and Research Centre/IIRR Study," "Structural Transformation Study in Cavite," the "IIRR Credit Program," etc. - did well to teach the IIRR network about what works and what does not.

7B. Recommendation: That these efforts be continued and expanded to include similar topics in the other movements.

8A. Conclusion: At the end of each (ILT) session, every participant writes up a plan applying what he/she has learned at IIRR to a project back home. Some of these plans are quite well-written. They may be viable proposals which bring together the ILT methods with the participants' intimate knowledge of local circumstances/needs. Frequently, these plans cannot be brought to fruition back home because of limited resources or a need for some additional technical assistance.

8B. Recommendation: That IIRR follow through with limited support for selected ILT participants' plans which have demonstrated merit. This could quicken participant interest during training and make preparation of a plan more than a theoretical exercise. In addition, increased IIRR extension or intermovement exchange of expertise could fill the need for technical assistance for implementing some country programs designed by alumni.

9A. Conclusion: Historically, one of the reasons that the International Mass Education Movement (IMEM) spread to a large part of China was that the philosophy and methodology of the movement infiltrated public education and was accepted by local and national officials. Dr. Yen spoke to many large

audience in China and often met privately with key officials to change attitudes. By and large impact on the public school curricula has not occurred in the Philippines or in the other movements, perhaps with the exception of India.

9B. Recommendation: That IIRR devote further attention and study to ways of influencing public school systems and increasing popular awareness about proven development approaches. This topic should also be given greater attention at the ILT sessions, utilizing study findings as they become available.

Background on the PVO and the Movement

The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction is a PVO devoted to helping villagers throughout the world. It pursues an integrated approach to reconstruct the lives of people, tackling problems of livelihood, health, education and self-government. The major program thrusts of IIRR are: International Leadership Training, Field Operational Research, and International Extension. IIRR is based in Silang, Cavite, in the Philippines and has its US office in New York City. IIRR was incorporated in New York in early 1960s, but its origins trace back to World War I. More about that in a moment.

IIRR operated out of a New York base in the early 1960s, but moved to its current headquarters and campus in the Philippines in 1966-67. Today IIRR has a large international staff of about 100 people, largely Filipino. The US office maintains contact with American funding and development agencies in the US and elsewhere, and provides support to operations in the Philippines. Related movements have sprung up in Colombia, Guatemala, Ghana, The Philippines, Sri Lanka, India and Thailand. Some of these movements are strong, as in the case of those in India and Colombia; and some are weak, such as those in The Philippines, Sri Lanka and Ghana.

I have now had contact with three of these affiliated movements: in India, The Philippines and Thailand. The last of these two are the subjects of later sections of this report. A discussion of the Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement is to be found in my trip report of March 1982. These movements vary considerably in their style of operation, their type of leadership and in their degree of adherence to IIRR principles/philosophy.

In sum, the rural reconstruction movements represent an extraordinary resource to help poor people achieve desirable economic and social gains. IIRR possesses a special capability in international leadership training which should

be more broadly touted and acclaimed. Unlike many organizations working in the development business, IIRR demonstrates both the capacities to learn and to teach. This special resource should be more fully used by PVOs, other development agencies and AID in the future.

History

This story begins long before there was an IIRR. Y. C. James Yen was a young Chinese graduate from Yale, in the period of World War I in 1918, when he volunteered to go to France to act as an interpreter for the roughly 200,000 illiterate Chinese coolies who were working with the British and French allies. Responding to an advertisement in a paper in the States, Yen, an idealist, decided that he wanted to do his part to help the Chinese allies in the war effort. He found when he reached France that 95 per cent of the coolies were illiterate. Many of them knowing Yen as an educated man, a scholar in the Chinese tradition, asked him to write letters for them to their families back in China. Once word of this got out to the body of coolies, Dr. Yen's time was not his own. In self defense he decided he would try to teach them to read. In China, this would have been considered a fruitless effort. However, stirred by necessity, Yen developed a set of 1,300 common characters which he selected, and he reduced the number of strokes needed to write these characters. In the beginning Yen selected 40 students of some 5,000 who volunteered to learn this new approach. There were 96 lessons of one hour each taken by the coolies after long and incredibly demanding physical activity throughout the day. Yen found, however, that the desire of the coolies to learn to read was incredible. Historically, of course, poor Chinese consider themselves a class apart from the scholar. The opportunity to learn, obviously triggered by a new cultural setting, allowed these Chinese to reconceptualize their own capabilities. The results were amazing. Of the 40 students, 36 passed. On the strength of this the program was expanded to all the Chinese allied forces.

This experience redirected Yen's life. On his return to China he organized literacy campaigns for ultimately millions of his unschooled countrymen. Yen first worked under the auspices of the YMCA. Later he worked in the county of Tien Hsien where he eventually developed an integrated approach to development. After Dr. Yen left the YMCA he worked under the Chinese National Association of the Mass Education Movement (MEM) which focussed on literacy for the masses.

The county of Tien Hsien encompassed a population of about 400,000 people, which represented about one per cent of the

Chinese population at that time. As the literacy program grew it became obvious that lack of ability to read and write was only part of the problem which faced rural Chinese. Yen's people found that the literate was just as hungry as the illiterate. Therefore, a livelihood (employment) program was developed. By 1928 health was identified as a barrier to rural reconstruction, and it was given emphasis. In 1934 the final pillar in the four-fold integrated approach of IIRR, self-government, was emphasized. This program expanded all over China. Before the Chinese revolution in the late 1940s, it impacted on millions of Chinese. Interestingly, Mao Tse Tung founded the Hunan Chapter of literacy training, working with this same YMCA mass education movement in China in the 1920s and 1930s. It seems clear that Mao learned many of his lessons in organizing people from his literacy training experience. The famed "barefoot doctor" approach also grew out of the movement.

The International Mass Education Movement (INEM) emerged in the late 1930s and 1940s. For his work, Dr. Yen was honored many times. In 1943, on the 400th anniversary of Copernicus, he was hailed as one of the ten modern revolutionaries, together with Albert Einstein, Henry Ford, Oliver Wright and John Dewey. In 1960 he was given the Ramon Magsaysay Award which is roughly the Asian equivalent of the Nobel Prize. Yen has been awarded several honorary doctorates in the intervening years. He was the subject of an interesting small book by Pearl Buck in 1945 entitled, The Story of James Yen. Both Buck and Eleanor Roosevelt attempted to support Yen's international program both in the U.S. and abroad in the period leading up to, and particularly following the Chinese Revolution in 1948/49.

After the Revolution, Yen went to Taiwan, and as the staff of IIRR tells the story today, the Rural Reconstruction Movement looked for a new home in one of the developing countries. A number of countries were considered, including India and Thailand, but ultimately The Philippines was selected as the new home for the Movement because of avid support and the invitation of the Philippine people.

In 1952 a group of prominent Filipino leaders from the private sector and government met to form a new organization in the Philippines known as the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM). In the early days, the PRRM operated in the same area as the "Huk Movement" (Hukbo Mapagpalaya ng Bayan - HMB). This was a national people's army which had organized popular Filipino resistance to the Japanese during the war. I was told that "Huk" caused no trouble to PRRM because they knew it was working for the people.

Over the years, the Readers' Digest has carried a number of

articles on Jimmy Yen and the various movements that he has been a part of. There have been some seven English language articles to date. An eighth in Chinese published in Hong Kong came out in May 1983. Historically, one of the reasons for this was that the former Editor of the Readers' Digest, De Witt Wallace, was a strong supporter of Yen and his Movement. As a result of his efforts some \$20-\$25 million in contributions were raised, I was told by IIRR staff. In 1961, in one of the articles on Yen the author encouraged the American government, the Kennedy Administration and the Peace Corps to look carefully at the methods used by PRRM to adapt them to the Foreign Aid Program of the U.S. Government.

Of the seven movements affiliated with IIRR which are operating today, the first to be created after the one in the Philippines was the Guatemala Rural Reconstruction Movement in 1965. This was followed by the Colombia Rural Reconstruction Movement (1965 also), the Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement (1967), the Ghana Rural Reconstruction Movement (1972), the Sri Lanka Society for Rural Reconstruction (SSRR 1977), and the Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement (1979). Unfortunately, none of these movements seems to be as strong as the original mass education movement in China. However, the potential of the individual movements, as well as the network that exists among these movements, represents an extraordinary resource for international training, research and extension to help address problems found in rural areas of the world.

The Recent Past

The recent past of the IIRR/PRRM movements in the Philippines has been bumpy. Since IIRR established its headquarters in Silang in 1967, PRRM has had a fairly uneven history. In 1968 the PRRM President was Manuel P. Manahan, a close friend of Dr. Yen. He successfully headed PRRM until the early 1970s. Under Manahan the program in the Philippines pursued a somewhat revised approach to development called Interagency Collaboration and Popular Community Participation (IAC/PCP).

In the early 1970s, Baltizar Armando became President of PRRM. He pressed for greater independence of the Philippine Movement from IIRR. This created a gap in relationship between the organizations, and in 1971 PRRM was "closed". In the period 1973-1978 there was no President of PRRM and the program was held together through dint of hard work by a very small number of devoted Filipino staff. During this time, one organization which supported PRRM activities was World Education, Inc. (WEI). In 1978-79, Manahan became Executive

Director as well as Chairman of PRRM, and attempted to revitalize the Filipino program.

Since late 1979 there have been a number of changes in leadership, and a period of time when the PRRM was run by a Management Council. Now the program seems to be on a firmer foundation, albeit still devoid of any real activity. Mr. Enrique Victoriano was selected President in 1982. He was the candidate of Dr. Yen and is generally well regarded in the Philippines. Mr. Victoriano also heads a cooperative group called AMSEF which is a subrecipient of a CRS co-financing grant from USAID/Philippines. There is more about the PRRM program later in this report.

IIRR has expanded its program to include a very large field research and operations component in Silang. This seems to have had the effect of creating a power vacuum; the Philippines movement has been weakened by competition with IIRR, as well as by problems of leadership and finances noted above. The PRRM might be revitalized if it undertook field operations work akin to IIRR's and/or if IIRR would divest itself of principal concern for field operations in The Philippines.

Financial Status

IIRR's financial statement through the period ending December 31, 1981, shows that IIRR had a total budget of about 1.3 million dollars. Of this, about half of all income came from private contributions, and a little over one third came from the matching grant from the Agency for International Development. Training fees and interest income made up most of the rest of the sources of revenue. Overall this is a very small budget considering that IIRR maintains a staff in the Philippines and New York of about 100 people. Although IIRR's financial status is considered generally sound, the financial statement does show that fund balances at the end of 1979 and 1980 were greater than that in 1981.

It would be gratuitous to say that IIRR needs to have a firm financial footing. It is clear that the Institute requires a healthier financial basis in order to satisfactorily continue its operations. Heretofore the problem has been that senior officials in the organization have had to devote considerable time to fund raising in order to maintain adequate resources to allow the program to continue. This has taken away valuable time from other pursuits related to program development.

There are no magic solutions to this problem, but there are several alternatives that IIRR might wish to pursue, none mutually exclusive of the others. The following are options that IIRR should consider in its future fund raising endeavors.

(1) Dr. Yen is the embodiment of the rural reconstruction movement. His unique background and worldwide experience should be fully brought to bear, both in the U.S. and abroad in increasing the amount of funds raised. IIRR should consider establishment of an endowment to be used to increase capital resources for ongoing support of program activities. The major sources of such support should be private and international.

(2) The farm in Silang, Cavite can produce an increasing amount of commercial food products on its 125 acres. IIRR has established a campus self-sufficiency project and fund to help cover operating expenses of its program. This fund may help offset operating costs of the site and provide a new and important source of income for IIRR. However, IIRR cannot expect to achieve financial independence through this source alone.

(3) As IIRR increases its service role in providing international leadership training to PVOs, the income from training fees will grow. This can become a small, but significant source of revenue for IIRR. Many of the PVOs who have participated in the international leadership sessions have sent additional staff for similar training. As IIRR's reputation grows, this income from training fees also should increase modestly.

(4) IIRR should pursue other creative ways of raising funds. For example, efforts should be considered to utilize the television promotion to sensitize the public in the U.S., the Philippines and elsewhere to problems which IIRR movements address - hunger, illiteracy and disease. Actually, the leadership of PRRM was particularly interested in pursuing this idea in the Philippines. They were encouraged to contact the End Hunger Network in Los Angeles, California, to compare needs and resources.

The grant from the Bureau for Food Peace and Voluntary Assistance/Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (FVS/PVC) represents an important part of the financial support for IIRR activities. In the last three years \$1.341 millions have been provided by A.I.D. through the matching grant to cover program activities in international leadership

training, field operations research and international extension. This support seems to have been well utilized and managed.

IIRR is now preparing a new matching grant request for an additional three-five years of support. The goals of this partnership activity would include: (a) the conduct of more specialized international training, (b) the nationalization of the training curriculum through inclusion of experience from the affiliated movements, (c) improvement in the capability of the affiliated movements in program design, (d) enhancement of the rural reconstruction program in the Philippine laboratory, (e) strengthening of IIRR's technical and management capability, and (f) informing a wider audience of the experience of IIRR and the worldwide movements. It will be argued in this report that all but item (d) should receive AID assistance in the future. (See the Operational Research section later in this report.) International leadership training and international extension are the keys to successful IIRR/AID collaboration, in the view of this observer.

The matching grant will not provide IIRR with a firm financial footing. Though this source will be important, a strong foundation can only be built on private international funding. The support of AID will allow training and extension activities to grow. In addition, AID may wish to explore the feasibility of developing an indefinite quantity contract (IQC) to help service USAID Mission needs in working with local private voluntary organizations which would benefit from international leadership training.

International Leadership Training

IIRR possesses an unique capability in providing international leadership training. A total of 585 participants from 37 countries from all regions of the developing world have been trained. In addition, there have been a large number of Filipino Barangay scholars and organizational leaders who have been trained in the People's School in Silang, Cavite. Although this section is primarily concerned with the international leadership training (ILT), we will also consider some domestic aspects of the education and training activities of IIRR.

In 1981, expenditure for education and training activities totaled 38 per cent of IIRR's budget. This was up from 31 per cent in 1980.

Demand for the training in the international leadership program outruns supply by about two to one, according to staff of IIRR. Eighteen ILTs have been provided to different groups since 1965. In addition, special sessions/seminars have been mounted for World Vision (WVRO), Christian Children's Fund (CCF), and Outreach International (OI). IIRR has also held discussions with the staff of Save the Children Federation and may work out some kind of short course modules for SCF use in the near future. SCF is particularly interested in the subject of financing people's organizations.

The country representation of ILT trainees through April, 1983 is shown in the following list:

<u>Country</u>	<u>Total</u> ^a	<u>Movement</u> ^b	<u>Other Agencies</u> ^b
Thailand*	94	53	41
South Vietnam	92	-	92
U.S.A.	81	-	81
Philippines*	62	4	58
Indonesia	32	-	32
Guatemala*	30	27	3
India*	28	4	24
Nigeria	27	-	27
Ghana*	21	13	8
Colombia*	21	21	-
Bangladesh	16	-	16
Sri Lanka*	12	5	7
Other	69	-	69
	<u>585</u>	<u>127</u>	<u>458</u>

*Affiliated Movements

a Source: IIRR, Philippines, 1983

b Source: IIRR, New York, 1983.

Thailand has been the major recipient of IIRR training support. This training goes back to 1968, when the Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement (TRRM) was formed. Some of the trainees have been sponsored by the Royal Thai Government. The second leading beneficiary of IIRR training has been South Vietnam, which used IIRR facilities between 1967 and 1971 on five separate occasions. A number of Americans including those representing WVRO, CCF, and OI have received training. Other countries that do not have movements such as Indonesia, Nigeria and Bangladesh also have been major participants in the international leadership training of IIRR.

International leadership training was not always organized the way it is now. Historically, in line with Dr. Yen's action approach to development, the sessions were manned by field implementers. There were no full-time training staff. All training was done by people in the four sectors: livelihood, health, education and self-government. Since May of 1978 when Dr. Juan Flavio became President, the four sections have been integrated to provide a more consolidated effort to impact on the poor. Likewise, the training has been given a separate

unit with full-time staff. In 1983, there are five staff, headed by Dr. John Batten, who make up the international leadership staff. Dr. Batten also heads up Education and Training Services (ETS) which primarily serve Filipino needs. Dr. Batten has worked with the education and cultural sections in the past, and with the research activities of IIRR. However, recently he was asked to head up the education and training activities of IIRR.

The early ILTs were organized by the New York City office. The training was wholly pragmatic. People went to the field and learned how to promote health projects, agricultural activities, etc. Trainees shared experiences from the various countries that they represented and this constituted the main focus of the international training.

Since 1978 the training has been handled in a somewhat more systematic fashion under the separate unit. The training activities have been followed up with IIRR evaluation and visits to the national rural reconstruction movements. Actual trainee recruitment is now done by IIRR in the Philippines rather than in New York City. The training unit is attempting to make better application of the lessons learned from its field experience and from the programs of the various movements in other countries. IIRR is also making greater effort to tap the experience of other agencies, such as the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) in Los Banos, the South East Asia Research Organization (SEARCA)/Innotech, and other organizations, particularly in South East Asia.

In the past domestic training was focused on Barangay scholars, but there are now quite a number of Barangay scholars who have been trained and returned to the 80 or so villages assisted by IIRR in Cavite. Domestic training is now focused on special groups. Participants include representatives of development institutions, municipal leaders, and villagers. The domestic training activities are basically response oriented and have been since about 1979. The ETS program can mount training for Cavite groups with about two weeks notice. At the moment training is possible for almost 100 per cent of requests, I was told. IIRR, however, is not promoting any increase in its own training capacity. The People's School is really a model that can be replicated by other development agencies in the Philippines and elsewhere. It represents an example of what local leaders can do to promote development activities.

I visited one ETS-assisted project with IIRR staff at Don Severino Agricultural College, Indang. IIRR helped the college mount training for 150 agricultural extension students and 400 farmers, under an A.I.D.-funded project assisting

seven colleges. IIRR was given high marks by the college for its professional training and guidance. The college actually sought out IIRR's help because of its reputation. IIRR assistance was not built into the project design.

According to IIRR staff, the training unit possesses under utilized resources. The education and training section has professional staff who were recently recruited to improve communications skills, to develop curricula for local development organization use, and to train in cultural arts and in community development on-the-job. There are also staff who are capable in the area of literacy development. The ILT staff develop and coordinate the modules of the curricula for the ILTs, develop media presentations and generally provide administrative support. The physical and professional facilities for IIRR training are really excellent and need to be fully utilized.

According to IIRR staff, Dr. Yen would like to see IIRR develop alternative primary school curricula for use in the Philippines. This has heretofore been a low priority for the Institute because of other demands on staff time and resources in Cavite. Now other parties would be interested in collaborating with IIRR on the development of primary school curricula, which could be tested in the schools in the Philippines. These groups include some representatives from the Ministry of Education, with the encouragement of the World Bank, and Innotech, which is a branch of the South East Asian Ministry of Education. Consistent with Dr. Yen's work in China, this is an area which needs to be more fully developed. The potential for influencing government policy in the Philippines and elsewhere may be great, and developing an alternative primary school curricula, should be seriously considered by IIRR.

International Outreach and Two Affiliated Movements

Extension and outreach, historically, are important functions of a development institute. This is certainly true of IIRR with its formal affiliation with six national movements and development contacts in a number of other countries around the world. Therefore, it comes as a surprise that in 1981 only 14 per cent of total expenditures for program were used for international extension. Part of the reason for this is that international extension only came into being as a separate division in the late 1970s.

The International Extension Unit is a small unit consisting of two people, headed by Dr. Conrado S. Navarro. In addition, several other staff participate in international outreach

activities of the Institute on an as needed basis. Dr. Navarro is also the Assistant to the President, Dr. Flavier. Navarro is an experienced development professional who was much sought after by IIRR. Previously Navarro worked for the Development Agency of The Philippines (DAP). He has been with IIRR for about four years, and is extremely able.

There is a desire on the part of IIRR to promote more fully the work of the IIRR Movement in the affiliated countries. For example, a decade ago the Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement was an outstanding program, but because of internal difficulties and political problems the TRRM has lost much ground. Likewise, PRRM was an outstanding program in the early 1960s and into the 1970s. Today it is a shell of its former self. Recently, IIRR has made an effort through extension to revivify the PRRM. Leadership has been lacking and today not only is IIRR supporting the new Executive Director, Mr. Enrique Victoriano, but also two other members of PRRM staff. Much IIRR staff time and energy has been invested to PRRM's revitalization. Generally, the movements need to have this kind of assistance in order to grow and reach their full potential. The international extension/outreach program is extremely important to the future success of the rural reconstruction movements around the world.

IIRR needs to increase the proportion of program expenditures for international extension activity, to better meet the needs of sister movements. Greater attention should be given to the travel opportunities of senior staff for purposes of consulting and providing technical assistance to countries elsewhere in the movement. In addition the role of evaluation, discussed later in this report, could be provided more fully by IIRR staff who are performing more thoroughgoing outreach functions.

The matching grant calls for technical assistance to be extended to national rural reconstruction movements by IIRR over the period 1981 to 1983. This technical assistance is extended to the affiliated movements in three ways: international training, consultancy visits, and joint projects. Since 1981, 15 personnel from five national movements have attended ILTs in the Philippines. Of these 15, three have resigned from their movements, and one has passed away. The others continue to work for their national movements.

Over the three-year period consultancy visits have been made by senior IIRR staff for purposes of assessing the status and technical requirements of the movements. Needs that have been addressed to some degree or another in these visits have

included improved organizational management and problems related to project planning and implementation and fund raising. Five of the seven existing movements, in The Philippines, Thailand, Colombia, Ghana and India, have been visited three times in the three years. The other two movements, in Sri Lanka and Guatemala, have been visited twice. It is expected that before the end of 1983 visits will be made to non-affiliated programs in Nepal, Bangladesh, and Indonesia.

To date joint projects have not been developed to any great degree. Only one joint project has been initiated. The International Development and Research Centre (IDRC) and IIRR are jointly undertaking a "Comparative Study of the People's School Approach in the Philippines." PRRM is also participating. It is hoped that PRRM's research, evaluation and documentation functions will be enhanced through this jointly supported activity. In future, IIRR also has plans to do joint training and/or study of activities in India, Thailand and Ghana into 1984 and early 1985.

a. The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM)

I visited PRRM activity on Friday, May 6, a national holiday in the Philippines. I traveled with Mr. Victoriano in an AID vehicle to Nueve Ecija, which is north of Manila. We visited the PRRM facilities and then traveled about another hour to the field, where some proposed field project activities are expected to commence under PRRM guidance in the near future. My visit gave me an opportunity to not only look at one of the affiliated movements, but also to review PRRM assistance from World Education, Inc. (WEI), The Asia Foundation, and other PVOs.

The PRRM campus in many ways looks like an older version of the campus of IIRR. A number of buildings have been built over the years since the early 1950s with assistance from IIRR, Filipino institutions, American aid and other sources, and today they still stand. There is an excellent library, meeting and conference rooms, office space, training facilities as well as staff housing on the compound. However, given these excellent facilities, it is sad to report that very little effective use is being made of them for the once-grand PRRM program. Most of the space on the campus is being used on a fee-for-service basis by outside groups. At the time of my visit, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Ministry of Agriculture in The Philippines was holding a conference; supervisors of the Ministry of Education were holding a workshop to evaluate grammar school education; the

Back-to-Bible group was meeting in yet another facility; and a Taiwanese Oil Drilling Company was using several houses for temporary residences while they explored oil resources on the campus and neighboring land.

The Ministry of Health is receiving assistance from PRRM. With World Bank funding, the Ministry of Health (MOH) is working on a program in participatory community education which will provide skilled training to project staff in 150 Barangays. Under this program 400 mid-wives covering four regions will be trained; in addition, 6,000 Barangay leaders will be instructed in project design, implementation, and evaluation. This is an area in which PRRM is particularly well qualified. In addition, PRRM will introduce management services for Barangay groups and do feasibility studies which will result in proposals being sent either to the Ministry of Health or other donors to generate project activity in the field. At the time of my visit no activity had begun because the project money had not yet been released by the Central Bank in Manila. However, PRRM staff are already gearing up for support to this project by making a few dry runs to the fields and by drafting a handbook for the training process.

I talked with Mr. Tony Santiago, Director of Education and Training, who has been with PRRM longer than any other staff member, since 1953. Mr. Santiago related the history of PRRM, summarized earlier in this report, and contrasted the once-large scale activity with the humble program of the present. Santiago emphasized that over the last twelve years one of the prime supporters of PRRM work has been World Education, Inc. He said that they have provided professional assistance on a timely basis on a number of occasions. He said that their capability is second to none in the area of non-formal institution building. He emphasized that WEI is better than The Christian Children's Fund or Foster Parents Plan in this regard. He also liked the way they work through local organizations, rather than setting up their own programs. He said that he was very unhappy that Mr. Baldino, the former Director of WEI, had been relieved of his duties last year, since they had reached tentative agreement to have the assistance of a local WEI representative in The Philippines.

The WEI-assisted project work with the movement has been on hold since early in 1982 because of the financial difficulties of WEI. PRRM has had no indication of what future relationship it would have with WEI since a cable received in the early part of last year. Even granted the difficult circumstances that have faced WEI over the last year and a half, it seems very unfortunate that they had not taken time to explain their proposed course of action to PRRM. They have

had a good working relationship for too many years to treat PRRM in such a coarse fashion. My sense is that it is unlikely that WEI will be able to continue to assist PRRM.

Another PRRM staff member, Mrs. Connie Madayag, spent some time explaining other past activities of PRRM. Of particular interest was a project supported by The Asia Foundation (TAF) called the Self Employment Assistance Project for Rural Women. In this program, twelve income generating projects were developed with organized women's groups near PRRM. Assistance was provided by The Ministry of Social Services and Development and by the Municipal Government. Enterprises that were assisted included fish processing, slipper making, pig raising, commercial sales, sewing, etc. PRRM would like to have a follow-on project and has written a concept paper to explore possible funding sources. Mrs. Madayag told me that there are few donors who will buy a process approach, letting groups select specific projects. They were particularly happy with the relationship they had had with TAF. Madayag thought it likely that a follow-on project would be assisted by the Ministry.

I travelled to the field with Mr. Victoriano to a Barangay known as General Ricarte. This is not a site for a PRRM project, rather it is a project area which another group, the Agricultural Managers and Services Foundation (AMSEF), has assisted in recent years. AMSEF also is headed by Mr. Victoriano; at the same time he holds responsibility for PRRM, and suggests a mode called "contract farming" which Victoriano wishes to use in pursuing an expanded PRRM program in future. The project will attempt to encourage local farmers to augment the predominantly rice paddy economy of the villages with a "backyard technology for development" approach. This technique, which was used in the WEI-assisted project mentioned earlier, consists of the creation of diversified vegetable gardening and a livestock raising program. The purpose is to increase farmer income and improve nutrition levels through more diversified food products. The one AMSEF site that we visited appeared to be a very impressive small integrated garden operation. However, whether this project would be viable on a larger scale really cannot be assured on the basis of what little I saw of the project.

In one of those interesting twists of PVO fate in the field, I discovered that the group who had most recently documented the experience of the Barangay General Ricarte was the Institute of Cultural Affairs. ICA is in the process of collecting a number of case histories of development activities, not only in the Philippines, but from a variety of countries around the world. They are planning to share this information in a very large world conference to be held in India in 1984.

Interestingly this evaluation "document" also was being used by Mr. Victoriano to get a commercial bank in Manila to fund the credit component of the contract farming activity supported by AMSEF. Notwithstanding the ICA connection, it would appear that Mr. Victoriano and the pilot project that he has worked with in General Ricarte could be a useful model for PRRM to pursue in this area in the future.

b. The Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement (TRRM)

My exposure to the TRRM activities was minimal. I talked with the former President of the movement, Mr. Sneh Nilkamhaeng, and the current Director, Dr. Sopone Phukowluan. I met with Dr. Sopone for less than one hour while in Bangkok. His schedule and mine did not permit me to see the project or to have a longer discussion.

The TRRM began in 1969 and in the early 1970s reached its high point of activity. Since 1978, for all practical purposes, TRRM has been in decline. The reason for this is that Dr. Puye was forced to leave the country for political reasons and the movement was not able to find new leadership. Since 1981, when Dr. Mali resigned there has been no Executive Director of the program. Dr. Sopone is a board member who has agreed to volunteer his time to act as Director for a period of maybe 12 to 13 months to get the TRRM back in action. At the moment there are nine permanent staff and ten temporary staff who work at the project site and in Bangkok. The project is located at Chainart in the central plain of Thailand, a major rice and corn producing area of the country. TRRM's focus has been on rural farmers and over the years it has provided assistance to them in a number of different ways. Most recently in 1981 German foreign aid helped the movement establish an agricultural mechanics training program. There is now a women's training project sponsored by TRRM and modern farm training, including mechanization. Because of limited financial resources TRRM has discontinued loans to nonproductive farmers or those who have misused loans and has concentrated on a more limited number of recipients. According to Dr. Sopone, TRRM is unique in using what he calls a "coaching approach." Follow-up training in villages is given by actually going to the homes of the trainees. This is a sort of on-the-job training in the villages themselves. TRRM does not take students to a training center, but works only in this on site-mode. TRRM sees their program as a continuing education activity. They provide general education and some specialized education, as noted above, for adults, women and even children. There is little emphasis on physical development of village facilities.

Operations, Research and Evaluation

Field operations, research and evaluation have always been important components of the IIRR development process. Historically, Dr. Yen has emphasized the importance of going to the people, living among them and learning from ground level the needs and resources that make up the development situation in a rural area. Therefore, it is not surprising that a major portion of IIRR's expenditures are devoted to field operational research and related activities. In 1980, based on the financial statement of the PVO, 62 per cent of expenditures were for field operations research. This declined to 48 per cent of total program expenditures in 1981. However, over the last several years there has been a significant increase in the number of field workers at IIRR. In 1978, according to IIRR staff, there were 48 field workers; in 1983 there are 63.

Dr. Yen, and by and large all senior staff at IIRR rightly insist, that it is impossible to carry out international extension and international training without having your feet planted firmly in the soil of rural development activity. They see operational research as the source of knowledge for rural reconstruction. Only with empirical evidence and experience is it possible for IIRR to share knowledge with affiliated movements in other parts of the world.

Cavite has been the social laboratory of IIRR since it was founded. IIRR field staff had acted as a catalyst for much significant development in Cavite. The peoples' school system which provides integrated training to rural reconstruction, would find it impossible to operate without real world experience of the kind gained in Cavite. The Barangay scholars who have been trained in the peoples' school and have returned to 80 or so villages in Cavite, have had a multiplier effect in translating what they have learned to their colleagues, friends and family members in the villages served. They have been a force for self-help development that probably could not have been achieved so quickly or cheaply, without them. IIRR has demonstrated clearly that it can work with illiterates, simple farmers, old and young people with very different social and cultural backgrounds to achieve significant development in rural areas. However, IIRR is certainly not the only PVO to have demonstrated these facts; they are unique in having a system which can be shared through training and through extension with people in a number of other countries.

Evaluation is an important part of the rural reconstruction project cycle, as described in detail by staff during my visit. IIRR's process is thorough and participatory. It

includes systematic task analysis, identification of responsible persons, and the identification of strengths and weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in a given project or village. Evaluation is used, not only to find out what is going on, but as a direct element in the development process itself.

Field Operations

I visited a number of different types of development activities during my time in Cavite. All of the projects that I saw were village based, involved the leadership of Barangay scholars, and were organized around cooperatives made up of members from the local communities. Some of the cooperatives were primarily for men, and others were primarily for women. Several of the cooperatives had mixed male/female participation. The prime motivation for the formation of the cooperatives was economic in all cases. That is not to say that social and other benefits are not also a part of the program, but these were secondary. I saw projects that emphasized multiple cropping of pineapples, bananas and coffee; cattle fattening; and pig raising.

IIRR also works through means other^{than} the village cooperatives. For example, we visited the municipality of General Trias. The municipal government is setting up a number of activities which will be run by the local government and the people, independent of IIRR in future. One interesting development which municipal officials explained to me was their vision to create their own peoples' school, which will receive technical assistance from IIRR staff. Health is also a purpose for some of the organizations that IIRR assists. One that I saw, in the village of Tractora, was a project called Health Through Non-Health Organizations. This project centers on the milling of corn, one of the major crops of this area. However, in addition to the production of agricultural commodities, some of the women members of the cooperative have been trained to provide a very small and informal drug store located in the home of a woman Barangay scholar.

Yet another means of working with local people was demonstrated by the CAFFMACO project. CAFFMACO is a small local industry which produces feeds for livestock production in Cavite and beyond. IIRR has played an important role in providing technical assistance to a former Barangay scholar, in getting authorization with the Philippines Government, and in providing expertise to produce competitively. Financial assistance for this project has come from a variety of sources. Primary among these has been the German Freedom from Hunger Foundation, the United Presbyterian Church, CODEL, and the membership of 228 who belong to the cooperative that runs

CAFFMACO. CAFFMACO has proven to be a very successful small enterprise. In 1982 it produced 2.6 million pesos (about \$250,000) in sales with a gross income of 313,000 pesos (about \$30,000). This is big money for Cavite. The industry employs 14 workers, all of whom are unskilled; it is run by a board of five members and a staff of ten people. CAFFMACO produces feeds mainly for poultry and pig raising, and is generally able to sell below its competitors in Manila and other areas. Demand is said to be continuing to grow. The quality of the product is judged by IIRR to be quite high compared to other products available. Heifer Project International (HPI) has also provided critical technical assistance to CAFFMACO, and in the beginning actually provided the first site for CAFFMACO operations. According to the manager of CAFFMACO, Mr. Espiritu, without IIRR's help it is very doubtful that this industry would have "gotten off the ground."

In summary, field operations represent the most important activity of IIRR today in terms of its program expenditures, staff utilization, and time and energy. To date, IIRR has operated very directly in providing technical assistance and other needed inputs to the various field activities described above. Considerable effort has been given to institutionalize these projects, by IIRR. Staff told me that time and resources are being severely stretched. It is difficult to provide the necessary research and international extension functions under these circumstances.

Research and Evaluation

IIRR is putting great energy into research and evaluation to map out a clear development path in future. They want to identify their own objectives and determine how they can best measure the impact of their work. In 1980, field operational research was divided into separate units, including integrated operations research, sectoral operations research, and research for adaptation of the peoples' school system. Integrated operations research is motivated by the desire to better understand who are the people served by development. The sectoral unit studies new strategies for health, livelihood, etc.

There are several interesting and important studies that are now underway. Especially interesting, is a study jointly funded by IIRR and the International Development and Research Centre in Canada. The Canadians have provided \$111,000 for a two-and-a-half year project which began in July 1982. The objectives are to compare and contrast the peoples' school experiences of PRRM, World Vision, Outreach International, and a private government agency in area of the Philippines called Antique. The study is looking not only at the process of

development but the PVO/institutional strategy and the local environment in which the projects take place. They are concerned about the way people organize, the development of leadership, and the transfer of technology. The study seeks to measure the impact of different strategies in different contexts. It will be completed at the end of 1984 and be published at that time. If success is demonstrated IIRR hopes to transfer this approach to other national movements. IIRR also will be training researchers of cooperating agencies to pursue this kind of investigation in other areas. Although results are only now just starting to come in, what has been learned so far seems interesting and potentially quite helpful to the development process. For example, they have found that training local people who return to their village, in complementary skills such as health and pig raising, is more effective than training more than one person in the same skills. They have also found that in Antique the male/female couples, work well as leaders and complement one another's abilities. In another locale called Isabella, they have found that it is better to have trainees go back to the community and act as facilitators who set up demonstration projects rather than provide them any kind of certification of graduation.

Another study which began in February 1983, sponsored by IIRR, is called "Structural Transformation of Cavite." The focus of the project is to answer the questions: who are the poor? and why are they poor? The results of this study should be available by mid-1984. Other research is focusing on IIRR's credit program and on the effects of project integration. In the case of the credit research, the objectives are to answer questions like: How do member-owned credit institutions serve the people? What technical and management inputs are needed? Under what circumstances are responsible community leaders found? How can rural enterprises be capitalized? The study will look at both small land owning farmers and the landless in villages and municipalities. In another study by IIRR, the focus is on past experience in promoting project integration, that is, the provision of say health education, rice production training, and motivational training. The study is looking at such things as days lost from work due to illness in rural areas; and the impact of the provision of family planning materials.

These various examples of field research being carried out by IIRR staff and participating agencies bid well for future learning. There is much that can be gained from the close examination of the work of development activities in the rural world. However, even though field operational research represents roughly half of IIRR's program expenditures, only a relatively small portion is being devoted to research and

evaluation activities per se. It is my view that greater resources should be devoted to research and evaluation, even at the expense of IIRR's direct involvement in the various field operations described earlier in this section.

IIRR's preeminent contribution to development and its comparative advantage as a PVO, are in the areas of international training and international extension. It is the view of this observer that a gradual shift in resource allocation should be made by IIRR from field operations to international training and international extension. In addition, such a shift would be healthier for the Philippines if Filipinos representing the PRRM national movement were to directly participate in all Philippine field operations. A shift of the kind suggested here could benefit the institutionalization of PRRM and increase the relative attention paid by IIRR to extension and training activities to serve the many national movements to which it is affiliated. IIRR's field operations research and evaluation activities should tap the social laboratories of the several movements and not be entirely devoted to the experience of a single province in rural Philippines.

The board and staff of IIRR should carefully consider ways of redistributing the limited resources it has available for its important work. My expectation is that IIRR would serve international development more fully by devoting itself to international extension and international training.

Appendix A: IIRR Comments Contained in Ping Chin's Letter of August 4, 1983

Because of your recommendation 6B, I would like to comment on why we stress the social laboratory approach, and why we attach great importance to operating our own social laboratory. This does not however preclude our collaborating with the national movements, incorporating their experiences in our international training, and holding joint training sessions on their sites and using their social laboratories.

First of all, what distinguishes our training from perhaps the training conducted by universities and other agencies, as you know, is that our curriculum is based essentially on the lessons we learned and are learning from the field, working directly with the people. It is one of our major objectives to test and develop better strategies and more effective approaches with the participation and collaboration of the people to help them meet their needs. We then in turn share these experiences with the larger development community worldwide.

Through the years, we have had some successes. For example, the agricultural approach to teaching family planning (developed by Juan Flavier) the People's School Approach to diffuse technology among large numbers of rural people (which is now being tested also in Guatemala, and in part in Thailand and Ghana), the training in management and handling of credit using simplified modern management techniques of leaders and members of people's economic organizations (spearheaded by Tom Olson). We have subsequently been requested to conduct workshops on this subject for rural bank managers of Malaysia and Indonesia. The current project of how to help those in the lowest economic strata in village communities also shows promise. Much more should be done. We are exploring several other new ideas based on the problems we find in most third world countries.

It seems that without a dynamic and effective social laboratory, our training will lose much of its usefulness and effectiveness.

As to collaborating with PRRM and using their field as the social laboratory, this does not seem feasible. The most important and practical reason is that PRRM is an independent agency, not a subsidiary or branch of IIRR. To be able to carry out high-quality field research, we need to be on top of what we do. It will be difficult for us to tell PRRM what to do, and to direct their workers in such studies. Nor would it be appropriate, in view of their being an autonomous agency. Even with our own field studies, we have encountered administrative and technical problems that can be overcome only by closer supervision and stronger direction. For example the IDRC supported research studies on the four People's School models. There have been some problems with the agencies in conducting the research. The question that is now being raised is how directive should we be when we work with independent agencies.

Then, among the observations of the participants of our training, one is they would like to see more demonstrations in the field of what we discuss in the classroom. We are much aware that our field program needs strengthening. We need to be able to better identify the critical problems facing rural people in their third world, and based on our own strengths and past experience, select the ones we should undertake and then design and test more effective strategies for meeting these problems. Such undertaking requires top-flight staff - both creative specialists to design and direct the studies and analytical scholars who can evaluate, interpret and synthesize the results, and document them for sharing. In-depth studies of this kind are vitally needed to help accelerate progress among peasant people in developing countries. Because of IIRR's unique organizational structure and functional setup, it has the potential to make such studies and then share them worldwide, but it will need to have a social laboratory or laboratories to do such studies under its own direction. As I said at the beginning, this does not mean we will not want to incorporate the experiences of the national movements in our sharing, whether through publications or international training.